EXHIBIT 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA AT CHARLESTON

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

:

-----x

THE CITY OF HUNTINGTON, :

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:17-cv-01362

Plaintiff,

VS.

AMERISOURCEBERGEN DRUG CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants. :

-----x

CABELL COUNTY COMMISSION, : CIVIL ACTION

Plaintiff, :

VS.

AMERISOURCEBERGEN DRUG CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.

NO. 3:17-cv-01665

VIDEO PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE

BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAVID A. FABER SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

JANUARY 6, 2021

First, plaintiffs argue that this is admissible for the non-hearsay purpose of notice, but that is incorrect. The standard -- Mr. Majestro kept saying that it can be for notice because of what the defendants could have known, Your Honor. That is not the standard for notice.

The standard for notice is what you knew or should have known. There is no dispute that the defendants did not have this IQVIA Xponent data that the plaintiffs want to admit. Their expert, Dr. Keller, admits that we didn't have the data.

So when Mr. Majestro says there's evidence that distributors used this data, that is incorrect. There certainly is not evidence that these --

THE COURT: That's a concern I have. What's the link between this, this data and the, and the, and the defendants in the case? I mean, it seems to me --

MS. HARDIN: None, none. There is no link, Your Honor, because not only did we not purchase the data, Dr. Keller was asked the very specific questions at her deposition: Should the defendants have gotten the data? Should they have known about it even if they didn't?

And I'll refer you, Your Honor, to her deposition on September 18th of 2020. It's Pages 156 and 157. And here are the questions she was asked. And she, she admitted no less than three times she has no basis to link this data to

this case.

She's asked: "Is it a requirement of designing and operating a suspicious order monitoring system to purchase third-party data of any kind?"

Her answer: "I don't know."

Then she's asked the very particular question: "Is it a requirement of operating and maintaining a suspicious order monitoring system to purchase IQVIA Xponent data specifically?"

Her answer: "I don't know."

Then she goes on to say she doesn't know what the requirements specifically say with regard to suspicious order monitoring systems. And she says twice on Pages 157 that she is not offering an opinion on the requirements.

So we don't have the data, no dispute about that. And there's not a shred of evidence in this case that we should have gotten the data. All we have is their expert making the offhand remark that we could have gotten it, that we could have purchased it for millions of dollars.

But if that was the standard for notice, Your Honor, then anyone would be required to take notice of anything because what you can do and what you should be required to do are two very different things.

And it's not surprising that Dr. Keller was not able to make a statement that distributors, wholesale distributors

should buy this data because this data isn't intended for them.

This is data that is compiled by IQVIA for the purpose of primarily pharmaceutical manufacturers. And the manufacturers use the data to determine market trends. They use it to determine compensation, where they need to incentivize, and generally to determine the demand for their product so that they can sell more of it.

Distributors don't use this data. It's not marketed to them by IQVIA and they don't typically buy it, and we didn't typically buy it.

And the reason for that is, Your Honor, -- I mean, the plaintiffs say that what we should have done -- what we could have done -- excuse me -- what we could have done was get this data in order to monitor physicians' prescribing.

But that is not what wholesale distributors do. It is not our obligation to police prescribers. We do not regulate the practice of medicine. We have no ability to do that. And we have no authority to do that.

What distributors do is monitor wholesale prescription orders placed by their pharmacy customers. We do that on an order-by-order basis. We do not do that on a prescription-by-prescription basis.

And there is no testimony, no evidence whatsoever that this data, this IQVIA data is ever used by anyone in order

to maintain, set up, or operate a suspicious order monitoring system.

2.1

So the answer to your question, Your Honor, is none. There is no linkage between this data and, and this case and these defendants and what the plaintiffs want to do with it. So notice is not a sufficient basis on which to override a hearsay objection.

THE COURT: If, if Keller testifies that this information was relied upon to support the expert opinions, does that make the data admissible?

MS. HARDIN: No, sir, it does not. Her opinions -- again, Dr. Keller's opinions are subject to Daubert challenges, so I'll just put that out there on the record just for Your Honor's knowledge.

But if, if she is permitted to testify, she could testify only to what she's already said, of course, which is that this data exists and could be purchased.

She will, of course, be locked into her testimony, her admissions that we didn't buy it, we didn't have it, and she has no opinions about whether or not we should have gotten it.

But experts often rely on -- or are permitted to rely on evidence that is otherwise hearsay, as Your Honor well knows. That does not give the underlying evidence independent evidentiary value.

1	I, Lisa A. Cook, Official Reporter of the United
2	States District Court for the Southern District of West
3	Virginia, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and
4	correct transcript, to the best of my ability, from the
5	record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
6	
7	
8	s\Lisa A. Cook January 14, 2021
9	Reporter Date
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	